

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,920		02/25/2002	Leonard Pinchuk	BSI-507US	BSI-507US 3520	
23122	7590	05/03/2004		EXAMINER		
RATNERPRESTIA				PREBILIC, PAUL B		
P O BOX 98		PA 19482-0980		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	, -			3738		
				DATE MAIL ED: 05/03/200	1	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/082,920	PINCHUK, LEONARD	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 09 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic) a timely filed amendment whi	ation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	ued
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most partned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set	under forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifyi	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amend	dment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place	e the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	y
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> .		•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
10. Other:		Paul B. Prebilic Primary Examiner	-

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It does convince the Examiner that claim 1, step b is inherent, but not that steps c and d are inherent. In particular, the Examiner asserts that there is no original support for making the restricted means with a restricted diameter greater than the vessel diameter and also trimming the length to a length greater than the aneurysm when the stent is expanded to that maximum diameter. For these reasons, the Examiner maintains that the present claims lack original support.